DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 349 CE 024 839

AUTHOR	Jones, Joan Simon
TITLE	Vocational Education in Corrections: An Interpretation of Current Problems and Issues. National Study of Vocational Education in Corrections. Technical Report No. 1.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 77
NOTE	57p.; For related documents see CE 024 840-841 and ED 151 569.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center Publications, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210 ($3.80)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Change; Community Involvement; Community Programs; *Correctional Education; *Correctional Institutions; Delivery Systems; Literature Reviews; *Models; Needs Assessment; Prisoners; *Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Surveys; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Rehabilitation

ABSTRACT

This review and synthesis of the literature on correctional vocational education includes historical documents, recent surveys and reports, journal articles, dissertations, and speeches and presentations which were located by computer-assisted and manual searches of these data bases: Abstracts of Instructional and Research Materials in Vocational and Technical Education, Educational Resources Information Center, National Technical Information Service, Comprehensive Dissertation Abstracts, and National Criminal Justice Reference Service. To describe the state-of-the-art of vocational education in corrections, the review discusses surveys, reports, programs, and models which address these three "charges" made by researchers and program planners to the educational community and the community at large: to defuse the psychology of retribution, to establish job market-relevant, community-based vocational education programs, and to establish effective in-prison programs with high quality program design and delivery, needs assessment, and evaluation. Listings give the references that were reviewed and additional references that provide relevant discussion. (This and two other technical reports are included in the final report, ED 151 569.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185349

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS: AN INTERPRETATION OF CURRENT PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

National Study of Vocational Education in Corrections

Technical Report No. 1

Joan Simon Jones

The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

December 1977

CE 024 839

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE CENTER MISSION STATEMENT

The Center for Vocational Education's mission is to increase the ability of diverse agencies, institutions, and organizations to solve educational problems relating to individual career planning, preparation, and progression. The Center fulfills its mission by:

- Generating knowledge through research
- Developing educational programs and products
- Evaluating individual program needs and outcomes
- Installing educational programs and products
- Operating information systems and services
- Conducting leadership development and training programs

NATIONAL STUDY OF VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

Project Staff

Charles M. Whitson, Ph.D.
Project Director, July 1976 - September 1977

Paul E. Schroeder, Ph.D.
Project Director, September 1977 - December 1977

Robert Abram
Research Specialist

F. Patrick Cronin
Research Specialist

Karin Stork Whitson, Ph.D.
Research Specialist

Joan Simon Jones
Program Assistant

Rosetta Gooden
Graduate Research Assistant

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

FOREWORD

The state of the art of vocational education in corrections is elusive. It can, however, be studied in the light of the prevailing "models" of punishment and retribution, rehabilitation, and reintegration; the survey research which details needs, failings, and successes; and proposed models for effective programs.

The author has made an extensive review of the literature relating to vocational education in corrections and highlights current problems and issues. The psychology of retribution, community-based education programs, and in-prison programs, factors affecting vocational education activities, are identified. The kinds of thinking, program development, legislation, and implementation and delivery methods regarding vocational education in corrections are discussed.

This publication is a result of one of the activities of the National Study of Vocational Education in Corrections. Recognition is given to the project's advisory committee for their contribution to the project.

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The Center for Vocational
Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
I. PURPOSE AND DATA BASES	1
II. INTRODUCTION	3
III. CHARGES FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS	5
Defusing the Psychology of Retribution	5
Establishing Job-Market-Relevant Community-Based Vocational Education Programs	8
Establishing Effective In-Prison Programs: Program Design and Delivery, Needs Assessment, Evaluation	11
IV. SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS	37
REFERENCES	39
ADDITIONAL REFERENCES	45
PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE	53
STUDY OBJECTIVES	Inside Back Cover
PUBLICATIONS OF THE STUDY	Outside Back Cover

I. PURPOSE AND DATA BASES

The following paper is offered in partial fulfillment of the terms of a grant (VEA, Part C, Section 131 (a)) from the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education, to perform a National Study of Vocational Education in Corrections. Its purpose is to put in perspective the major issues in vocational education in corrections as they appear in the literature and to show trends. The review attempts to discuss the key concepts of vocational education in corrections, not as isolated topics, but as integral parts of what have become general charges for the general public. These key concepts involve rehabilitation, education, and work; prison maintenance and service and industry; adult basic education (ABE), secondary education (leading to a General Education Development (GED) certificate), postsecondary education, and college programs; programs for the incarcerated female; the needs of specific prison populations; instructional modalities; and the program failure cycle. It is hoped, moreover, that the review will serve as a "primer" for those who are interested in the history, issues, and trends in vocational education in corrections.

Since this paper is intended as a general report on the state of vocational education in corrections, only the literature (see REFERENCES) which the reviewer considered seminal and well-supported was used to identify the issues and trends and to draw conclusions. Literature providing supplementary dimensions to the issues and trends is listed in ADDITIONAL REFERENCES.

This paper is the result of both computer-assisted and manual searches of the literature using descriptors intended to locate historical documents, recent surveys and reports, journal articles, dissertations, and speeches and presentations. The following data bases were accessed through the Lockheed DIALOG Search Services available at The Center for Vocational Education.

AIM/ARM Abstracts of Instructional and Research Materials in Vocational and Technical Education (VT numbers)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center (ED numbers)

NTIS National Technical Information Services

Comprehensive Dissertation Abstracts

Searches were also requested through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) data system. The NCJRS descriptors used were --

- Educational Programs for Offenders
- Inmate Compensation
- Correctional Industries
- Vocational Training
- Work Release
- Ex-Offender Employment

Those documents not bearing a VT or ED number can be located by contacting project staff at The Center for Vocational Education. Ed-numbered documents are available as microfiche or hard (paper) copy through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). VT-numbered documents are available through The Center for Vocational Education library or, by cross-referencing with ED numbers, through EDRS.

II. INTRODUCTION

The literature of vocational education in corrections presents itself as an astounding tug and push between what was and what is, and between what is and what could be. It is both historical and descriptive, and provocatively prescriptive. It is a literature which can be honest and candid while it simultaneously undermines itself with the hidden assumptions and overt prejudices of writers, researchers, theoreticians, and practitioners who cannot deny where they come from or to what constituencies they are beholden.

The literature of vocational education in corrections is quite unlike the literature of vocational education for the gifted and talented, handicapped individuals, minorities, and femal s. The people in correctional institutions who will be touched, hopefully in a capacitating way, by vocational education programs, are in our culture "offensive." They have committed crimes-against-the-culture ("victimless" crimes notwithstanding) and therefore do not often benefit from the culture's bruised conscience. Offenders are not usually, as are other special needs groups, considered targets for education or social action programs which attempt to "enable" the disabled, recognize the unique, make possible some kind of social or economic mobility for the disadvantaged, or eliminate unfair biases which prohibit a class of people from performing to capacity and which, in fact, contribute to a cycle of poor self-concept and poor performance.

III. CHARGES FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

The status of education for offenders leads persons involved in research and program planning in corrections to "charge" the educational community and the community-at-large:

(1) to defuse the psychology of retribution which so often governs the community's and correctional administration's attitude toward offenders and so often results in security-focused, punishment-based institutionalization, the segregation of offenders from "legitimate" educational institutions, and individual and program stigma;

(2) to call for community-based educational programs which are truly reintegrative and provide extensive pre- and post-assessment and guidance as well as job market-relevant training; and

(3) to expect the implementation of in-prison vocational education programs which are at once psychologically rehabilitative and successful regarding training for satisfying work in the free world and which have program delivery systems which ensure, to the greatest degree possible, high quality program design, a smooth implementation process, a high rate of program completion, and adequate needs assessment and evaluation procedures for program renewal.

The literature addresses the charges described above most prominently in the form of surveys, studies, suggested models, and workshop presentations. The following interpretation of this literature will include explanation of the issues as they touch on the commonly heard charges for vocational education in corrections, discussion of the trends we can infer from the issues, and observations, conclusions, and prescriptions.

Defusing the Psychology of Retribution

Our habits of mind regarding transmission of culture and maintenance of the social forces which keep us going as individuals, communities, and nations have much to do with our sense of what to do with those who commit what we consider crimes against culture and society. Our earliest mythologies and philosophies abound with detailed descriptions of the punishments meted out to those who have so "transgressed" and are indeed analogous to the myths of crime and punishment which prevail today. These present-day myths reveal themselves

in the historical development of prisons and corrections as "models." The following discussion of prison development and these models as they appear in the literature should bear upon the issues involved in the vocational development of offenders.

Four general habits of mind, or "philosophies," are seen in the development of the prison system and the concern today with the preventive value education and training may have for offenders. The first of these is the Old Testament sense of retribution which showed itself in the crucifixions of centuries ago, in the stockades and witch hunts in colonial times, in the debtors prisons of the 17th century (Nagel, 1973), and today most prominently in capital punishment whereby society absolves itself of the crime of taking a life by adopting the eye-for-an-eye revenge model. Adoption of this model assumes the deterrent value of punishment and the maintenance of community standards (Stanley, 1976). Tied up in the retribution model is the idea of penitence. As Sylvia Feldman (1975) so aptly states--

> Punishing the criminal was meant to serve two purposes: To be "a threat and deterrent to potential law breakers" (Nagel, 1973) and to be a means of regeneration for the criminal by bringing about his repentance and so cleansing his soul. (p. 1)

The mid-1800's saw the development of a second philosophy of how to deal with criminals - that of restraint, i.e., incapacitating, if not taking revenge on, the perpetrator. This restraint model is exemplified in the Auburn, New York, prison in 1819 and in the revision of the Pennsylvania system in 1829, and is, like the retribution model, still part of the fabric of the modern prison system. In 1973, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency still recommended <u>restraining</u> dangerous prisoners while paroling others.

A third model in corrections is that of treatment, and subsequently rehabilitation, which evolved during the reforms of the early 1900's. However, the strands of retribution and restraint remain clear. The offender is still seen as someone who suffers from some dystrophy of the moral system and who will only get worse without treatment. Again, Feldman (1975) provides an accurate explanation of the ironies and conflicting forces involved in the call for rehabilitation.

> /<u>T</u>here is<u>/</u> the assumption that rehabilitation is a way of ". . . turning troublesome lawbreakers into respectable adherents of traditional values" (Nagel, 1973). Prisons are not only meant to safeguard society by

> isolating offenders but are meant as well to be mechanisms for change. Those to be rehabilitated are perceived as misfits: persons who are either psychologically maladjusted or inadequately prepared vocationally and educationally to adapt to the needs and values of society. (p. 1)

Before discussing the fourth general model of reintegration it may well be appropriate here to relate the historical role of work in prisons to the models of retribution, restraint, and rehabilitation. We may then more easily understand the more recent development of vocational education in corrections and its intimate relationship to the more contemporary reintegration model.

If, for example, we begin by looking at the nature of early sentences meted out, we see that the words "at hard labor" were prevalent (Whitson, 1977). The prisoner's hard labor was indeed society's revenge. However, with the change in philosophy from retribution to restraint and the subsequent increase in the numbers of those incarcerated, work in prisons served less as actual revenge than as maintenance of the prisons themselves. Prisoners were assigned jobs which resulted in prison-made goods sold for profit and which provided the prisons with cheap (i.e., unpaid!) labor for custodial and maintenance services (Bregman and Frey, 1975). Quite ironically, then, as free enterprise conflicted with the prison industry interstate sale of goods, and as legislation was enacted to prohibit interstate transporation of prison goods, such prisoner labor needed to be seen in a different light - prisoners' work came to be called "rehabilitative," i.e., a way of treating the offender and providing a solution to the problem of criminality. Prison administrators, well aware of the changes in corrections philosophy permeating the field, began to respond by calling the work of prisoners training for "work habits" (Bregman and Frey). The rehabilitation model took root, albeit not without the lingering presence of the earlier models of retribution and restraint. Once more, Feldman (1975) points out that even though prison administrations may subscribe to the rehabilitation model, there is often . . .

> a conflict between the goals of punishment and rehabilitation. It is doubtful that rehabilitation and punishment can be achieved simultaneously . . . too often . . . "the punitive spirit has survived unscathed behind the mask of treatment" (American Friends Service Committee, 1977). As a result, the goal of rehabiliation is often undermined rather than supported. (pp. 1-2)

The intimate relation of the role of work to the varying models for deliberating on crime and its results is

even more intimate when we look at the more recent philosophy of reintegration--the involvement of the offender in educational, vocational, and social development programs which attempt to effect his/her successful and satisfying return to the community. With the recent emphasis on accountability, with increased national awareness of the problems of the prisons, and with the provision of federal aid for corrections programs came a feeling that treatment and rehabilitation through in-prison jobs were no solution to criminality and that the work of prisoners ought to be more of a tool to develop skills for satisfying work upon release, to improve self-concept, and to encourage self-reliance and self-determination (Bell, Conrad, Laffey, Volz, and Wilson, 1977). Indeed, the psychology of retribution was not simply being addressed but beginning to be defused.

The reintegration model in corrections makes one primary assumption which automatically results in a rationale for vocational education in corrections. This primary assumption, that the offender needs to make some kind of effective adjustment to society, derives primarily from the fact that offenders have a history of short-term, low-skill, seasonal work at low wages and long periods of unemployment and that 95% of offenders will return to the community through parole or at the end of their sentences. A rationale which appears logical and valid for vocational education in corrections then develops from this assumption. The rationale goes something like this: the offender desires work more than s(he) desires to commit a crime and will therefore not "offend" if job skills and legitimate employment are within his/her grasp. In order to acquire the job skills necessary for legitimate, satisfying employment, the offender needs training in up-to-date, marketable skills and exposure to the best of teachers and teaching methods. Vocational education for the offender, then, is considered the mechanism by which the offender becomes first rehabilitated and then reintegrated into society with no economic incentive to return to crime. The offender is also, then, assumed to have no psychological incentive because excellent, relevant training has resulted in post-release job satisfaction (BOAE, 1976).

Establishing Job Market-Relevant Community-Based Vocational Education Programs

Following quite naturally from the preceding discussion is a consideration of the second charge--that of planning and implementing community-based vocational education programs which involve community input and acceptance and which recognize simultaneously both the need for training offenders in relevant job market skills and the need for helping offenders in the socialization and acculturation process other than that involved in the penal institution subculture. Thus, the

charge for community-based programs implies that vocational education and training is in fact vocational development and, as such, must deal with the issues of the offender's self-concept, personal history, and the nature of the community to which the offender returns. The following comments from a report on two community-based efforts in Ohio (Clark, 1974) reflect these points.

> There is a basic cultural challenge in removing offenders from the prisons that presently reinforce their socio-psychological isolation from society. Assisting their reintegration with society cannot be accomplished without the active support of the community itself . . . Community corrections violates the concept of punishment and walled confinement as an ethical or even useful means of corrections. (p. 5)

Remarks from Feldman (1975) further support the call for vocational education programs for offenders which are at once relevant to job market needs and also are community-based.

> New models need to be created and applied which attempt to bring to bear on the problem of crime and delinquency all the relevant resources in the community. Special emphasis in these programs should be given to assisting offenders become /sic/ self-sufficient, self-reliant contributors to the community good. (p. 16)

An example of a community-based vocational education program which incorporates the above theoretical statements is the Fort Des Moines Community Centered Project in Iowa.

> . . . it is most often used for offenders as an alternative to prison. Its program encompasses those generally described as work or education release . . . . /The offender's/ educational, vocational, and psychiatric needs /are assessed/ . . . . All inmates work on regular jobs in the community and attend full-time remedial education or vocational training programs offered by existing community resources . . . . /Students live in/ two-story Army barracks located on a military reservation . . . . There are no bars or fences . . . the facility is staffed sufficiently well to allow a great deal of personal observation and control. (National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, n.d. in Feldman, 1975, p. 16)

Various major research study results support the movement toward community-based education and training for offenders. One study recommends that all corrections education programs should "articulate more closely with institutions and organizations of the free community" (Reagen, Stoughton, Smith, and Davis, 1973). Another study recommends that state and local agencies increase their level of services for offenders in the community (Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower, 1968). The same study calls for federal dollars to be made available to the private sector for management, development, research, basic education, and job training for offenders.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations called for an expansion of community-based programs as well as regionalization of the state prisons and, thus, expanded work and study release programs which more deeply involve the community (Commission on Inter-governmental Relations, 1971). The Commission further supported a community-based educational program by calling for inmate training at prevailing wages in private industry branch plants.

The trend toward community-based programs is further recognized by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice which called for the involvement of colleges and universities in offender problem areas to be accomplished outside of the correctional institution (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice: Task Force on Corrections, 1967).

The literature has revealed the kinds of support cited above for community-based programs. But the literature of vocational education in corrections also reveals critical problems and constraints which inhibit and delay the development of quality vocational preparation programs outside of the correctional institution. One such constraint is the physical and cultural isolation of the prison's own vocational program from the community and labor world. This militates against any significant and productive contact with innovation and change in the nature of training and occupations (Whitson, 1976). Moreover, the lack of knowledge regarding the labor needs of the local community makes requests for community involvement difficult, if not unrealistic (Levy, Abram, and LaDow, 1975). Also, a local educational agency which could provide the vocational programs needed by offenders often will face such obstacles as a program which becomes stigmatized (and thus affects the credentials the offender receives) as well as much opposition from local citizenry (individual stigma) (Evan in Cronin, 1977).

Establishing Effective In-Prison Programs: Program Design and Delivery, Needs Assessment, Evaluation

Even though the movement toward community-based educational programs for offenders is gaining much momentum, and even if that movement enjoys substantial support from the educational community, the fact remains that the majority of offenders are not participating in community-based programs or, in some cases, any educational program at all. The charge of providing educational training programs for prisoners which at once mitigate the prison subculture lessons they learn and also provide them with social, vocational, and emotional skills for dealing successfully in the free world is all-important. In-prison programs should not suffer because superlative models for community-based programs are rapidly developing. The prisons and their inhabitants remain--the bars and walls will survive for some time even with the advent of more sophisticated funding formulas and exemplary community programs.

The need for vocational education programs for offenders in correctional institutions is widely professed, but often for reasons which result in ineffective programs. If, for example, it is thought that espousal of the Puritan ethic of salvation through work will result in inmate acceptance of and satisfaction with vocational programs, then the goals of the program cannot help but be at odds with the goal of corrections (Roberts, 1971). Likewise, if the vocational education program is looked upon as a panacea--a way of simultaneously solving the problems of prison operations and security, statutory funding requirements, and inmate vocational development, rehabilitation, and reintegration--its implementation can only be, at best, disjointed, haphazard, and unwieldy.

The literature which addresses the aspects of effective in-prison programs is lengthy. Therefore, this review will include, primarily, discussion of recent comprehensive surveys, studies, and reports whose results provide an appropriate way of looking at the kinds of corrections goals which should be part of effective vocational education in-prison programs. These documents, in their evaluation of a wide variety of programs, offer sobering data regarding what is wrong with those programs and, by implication, how effective programs should operate.

The Battelle Report

This 1974 report by Battelle Columbus Laboratories to the Department of Labor on vocational preparation in federal and state correctional institutions found that such vocational preparation was generally inadequate (Levy et al., 1975).

The results of the study's mail survey and 80 site visit interviews (wardens and 10 inmates/site) are hardly encouraging. While the survey found that approximately 95% of the ¼ million plus incarcerated felons would be paroled or released (a sizeable addition to the work force), it also found that only one (1) in five (5) of the activities in the prisons' industries and maintenance and service areas provided related off-the-job instruction as a supplement to on-the-job training, that less than half of these activities focused on skills for post-release employment, and that more than half the inmates were assigned to these inappropriate activities.

With such results as these it is not surprising that whatever formal vocational training was offered was also inadequate. The number of programs in each institution was found to be too small. More than 50% of the inmates desired training which was not offered. And, even though most of the institutions recognized the need for new programs, only half were planning to add any. Eighteen percent (18%) of the institutions had to curtail programs due to lack of funds. Moreover, of the mere 21% of inmates enrolled in these formal vocational training programs, only slightly more than half were expected to complete their training.

Although the quality and quantity of instructional personnel were found to be adequate, the criteria used in the study to determine such adequacy were, at best, questionable. Formal observations of instructors were not conducted. Instead, criteria involved extent of experience (1) in the present facility, (2) in another correctional facility, (3) in a free-world setting, and (4) in specific trades or occupational areas, as well as whether or not personnel were certified by appropriate agencies.

Program quality throughout the institutions was found to be inadequate. This determination was based on the fact that only 32% of the programs had adequate facilities and equipment; that there was a lack of institutional commitment to reintegration through vocational preparation; and that 86% of the institutions allotted less than 10% of their budget to vocational training. Moreover, only half of the vocational education supervisors saw acquisition of job skills as the goal of their programs. Appropriate and adequate testing, guidance, placement, and follow-up procedures were found to be lacking, and local job market information was generally not used because any subsequent changes of programs were perceived as too difficult to implement.

The Battelle survey further revealed data which made clearer the weaknesses of present programs and the need and potential for vocational preparation for offenders. It also posited recommendations for improving vocational preparation.

The weaknesses of vocational preparation programs in federal and state correctional facilities showed themselves in data which are disheartening. There was a lack of clear goals and commitment to vocational preparation for all inmates. Indeed, as mentioned previously, only half of the vocational training program directors surveyed saw the acquisition of job skills as the most important goal, and half of all inmates were unable to participate in any training program. Aside from lack of funds and minimum allocation in facility budgets for vocational training programs, the programs were not found to be meeting special or individual needs. This is clear simply from a glance at the number of programs and percent of inmates enrolled: large institutions offered an average of nine (9) programs each with nine percent (9%) enrolled; medium-sized facilities offered seven (7) with 28% enrolled; and small institutions offered four (4) with 38% enrolled. The programs were not geared to handicapped individuals, older persons, bilingual persons, or minorities and women.

Moreover, assessment and evaluation were inadequate and widespread: 40% of the institutions had no coordinator for vocational guidance and counseling and job placement services, and less than 50% had organized follow-up procedures. Operational problems affected programs also.

Scheduling training was difficult because of unspecified dates for prisoners' release. Prison work assignments were generally irrelevant to training programs undertaken, and over 40% of all the programs had not even been reviewed and/or accredited by the appropriate outside agencies.

There was, too, a great lack of community contact--essential even if the vocational program is housed within the correctional facility. Sixty-six percent (66%) of the institutions had no local citizens advisory committee for any programs--a fact which calls into question whether those programs prepare offenders in any relevant way for job placement and success in the free world. There was, also, other evidence of lack of community contact. Only 33% of the instructors provided for regular tours by business persons, and only 30% organized field trips for inmates to local businesses and industries.

Yet another weakness was the lack of coordination between on-the-job training and related instruction. Only six percent (6%) of the inmates working in prison industries, and only four percent (4%) in prison maintenance activities received related instruction. Only 14% of the maintenance activities involved approved apprenticeship training programs. And, in only 20% of the maintenance activities with apprenticeship programs could the trainee apply hours worked to outside

employment. The study also offered extensive documentation for the need for vocational preparation. The average inmate among the 224,000 inmate population was 24 years old, had not completed high school, and remained in prison less than two years. Half of the inmates reported having jobs awaiting them upon release--mostly obtained through friends or relatives--but half of these jobs involved unskilled or semi-skilled labor. Only 20% of the inmates reported that training programs aided them in finding jobs. Furthermore, the wardens estimated that 70% of the inmates needed job skills for steady outside employment but that only 34% of these inmates would acquire such skills.

The potential for vocational preparation is equally well documented. The study found, as noted previously in this paper, that the majority of inmates still must obtain job skills in prison, even though the concept of community corrections is attended to. The data show the potential, if not the eventuality, of this fact. For example, seventy-six percent (76%) of institutions with industries allow inmates to simultaneously participate in vocational training programs. Also, while only 57% of inmate maintenance activities prepare inmates for employment, 70% of the institutions with such activities let inmates take training programs.

And finally, the study offers recommendations which are sound, though most of them require increased funding. One recommendation supports the current movement toward smaller institutions and shorter sentences but notes that larger institutions (with more dollars) have more programs, although the opportunity to participate may not be so great. Another recommendation advocates pay for inmates and reveals that 60% of vocational training programs, 40% of prison industries, and 50% of maintenance and service activities allow for no pay for work done. When inmates are paid, the report adds, the pay is generally less than the minimum wage.

A third recommendation suggests motivating the establishment of quality programs through various reward systems for both prison administrations and inmates. Subsequent recommendations state that institutions need to be made less socially, not physically, isolated--that the distance from an urban center is not so much a factor regarding instructor salaries, use of local advisory committees, community contacts, and special programs as is the stigma already attached by the community to the correctional institution; that more and better work release programs involving greater numbers of inmates need to be established; and that shorter, more intensive, modular programs which allow for open entry and exit need to be implemented.

The Lehigh Study

A study recently completed by the National Correctional Education Evaluation Project (one of LEAA's National Evaluation Program projects) through the School of Education at Lehigh University discusses issues in correctional education programs for inmates (Bell et al., 1977). Aside from purely vocational training programs, the study addresses other types of educational programs which, indeed, must be offered along with and integrated with training programs in order to satisfy the needs of inmates at varied levels of achievement. The programs addressed in the report include Adult Basic Education (ABE), Secondary Education (or GED preparation programs), Postsecondary Education, Vocational Education, and Vocational Education for Female Offenders.

The study states that all federal prisons and at least 81% of state prisons have Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs, funds for which are provided by the Adult Education Act of 1966, and that there is a great need in the area of literacy (Helfrich, 1973). Fifty percent (50%) of prison populations were found to be functionally illiterate (Reagen et al., 1973), and at least 20% were found to have reading levels below grade 5.5 (Ayers, 1975; Research for Better Schools, 1974; Nagel, 1976, in Bell et al., 1977; Olson, 1975).

The study goes on to discuss the issue of voluntary inmate participation and incentives. One report states that ABE programs should have an internal system of immediate rewards and should be voluntary for those whose reading levels are above grade 6 (Research for Better Schools, 1974). The report also states that the issue concerns teacher competence more than educational techniques, that "concerned" teachers are important in inmates' evaluation of programs, and that a teacher in a correctional setting is more a model or learning manager than a dispenser of information. Moreover, the same report cites the need for uninterrupted class attendance, pre-instruction diagnosis, individualized behavioral objectives, individualized learning plans developed by both teacher and inmate together, innovative materials, up-to-date student records, counseling for release, and attractive learning areas.

Another issue addressed by the Lehigh study is that of making ABE relevant to preparation for work. Again, the Research for Better Schools report recommended that inmates in ABE programs be counseled to continue their programs in adult education centers upon release (Research for Better Schools, 1974).

The issue of effective implementation of resources and materials in ABE is also discussed both in terms of the

need for a better communication system, or exchange, among all ABE programs and the need for a viable link between ABE state agencies and correctional education administrators and teachers (Helfrich, 1973). Moreover, teachers and administrators have had difficulty in finding materials and resources which have proven effective with inmate learners (Roberts and Coffey, 1976), and there is a lack of trained, skillful, creative teachers who can use these resources, i.e., who have a functional knowledge of available materials for the adult learner (Reagen, et al., 1973).

The Lehigh study cites many sources on the issue of the paucity of evaluations and conflicting views regarding evaluations. It has been said by some, for example, that ABE program evaluation should be restricted to observable behaviors established as goals (Ryan, 1973). Others, however, would base evaluation only on the academic and vocational skills acquired by the inmates, not on rehabilitation goals achieved (McKee, 1971). And still others view evaluation as either the impact on recidivism (Roberts, 1971; Lipton, Martinson, and Wilks, 1975); the impact outside the correctional institutions (Singer, 1977), or in terms of immediate effects (requiring pre- and post-testing) and long-term effects (requiring a five-year follow-up) (Research for Better Schools, 1974).

The Lehigh study states that one of the most important issues in correctional secondary education is the creation of "educational districts" within the penal system so that state and federal financial resources become available. This involves, however, the willingness of correctional educators in the penal education district to give up some of their control to those whose goal is education, not security. For example, GED testing, when it requires out-of-cell remediation, can be a threat to those concerned with security and adequacy of space. Too, frequent absenteeism caused by conflicting administrative scheduling of work assignments or counseling can be frustrating for the inmate as well as instructional staff. Often, the study reports, there is hostility from administrators and guards toward the inmate who is getting what they perceive as a "second chance" for education. Hostility also arises between corrections officials and teachers.

This issue leads into the next--the need for defined objectives. The question arises whether the secondary education program is seen as part of the total program (which includes vocational education, college preparation, etc.), or whether it is to become an end in itself.

In terms of the GED testing procedures issue, many problems must be addressed. For example, lengthy test waiting

lists, combined with early release, parole, transfer, etc., cause some inmates to fail to receive their certificates. Also, too much diversity in the pretests used for GED testing results in an extremely limited profile of students' achievement level and ability to enter the GED program.

There is, moreover, the issue of false motivation--the subtle coercion of inmates to enroll in the educational program because of the better opportunity for parole (Kerle, 1977, in Bell et al., 1977); the instructional quality issue--the use of paraprofessional inmate teachers (Dell'Apa, 1973; Black, 1975); and the program delay issue--the delay of inmate education due to the conflict between admission processes, academic timetables, etc., and program entry procedures for state and federal prison inmates (in federal institutions, program entry is often on a once-a-week basis; in state prisons entry is on a semester basis) (Clark, 1977, in Bell et al., 1977).

Further, most of the secondary education instructional materials available for correctional programs are either designed for high school students (thereby encouraging disinterest and low motivation) and/or are geared to passing the GED test. The educator then finds it difficult to determine the necessity for particular program materials prior to requesting funding for resources because there are no guidelines for choosing effective materials.

Yet another issue is the evaluation of secondary programs regarding factors other than testing results. It has been strongly suggested that all aspects of the programs be evaluated (Whitson, 1976). Factors to be considered would then include such things as marketability of the equivalency certificate, the effect of GED preparation on inmate behavior and social acceptability, validity of the GED certificate in the inmates' social milieu in the free world, and recidivism rates as well.

And, finally, there is the issue of GED preparation as college preparation, i.e., the fact that some inmates perceive the GED certificate as an indication of their ability to function in a postsecondary program (Williams, 1977, in Bell et al., 1977).

Disproportionate attention has been paid to college-level programs, as opposed to basic education programs, over the last decade (perhaps because promotion of postsecondary programs seems to be accepted as the most effective "PR"). More inmates have completed high school, and funding possibilities have been expanded. But, at the same time, problems and issues in postsecondary education in corrections have developed. The Lehigh study addresses some of these.

The issue of the student selection process is especially prominent in the postsecondary area. Selection for these programs is too often based on time remaining in the sentence, security clearance, and the nature of the offense. There is, moreover, poor counseling concerning program criteria and lack of thorough pre-admission testing of applicants regarding intelligence, achievement level, and personality characteristics (Marsh, 1973).

Teacher attitude appears to be an important issue, too, in postsecondary correctional programs. Teachers are often more lenient in their demands with inmates than they would ordinarily be with any other group of postsecondary students. This leniency can translate as low expectation and "specialness" which can of course affect student motivation adversely (Semuro, 1976).

In addition, the study points out, there is great concern about the inadequacy of the postsecondary program libraries and materials and laboratory space (which makes it nearly impossible to offer physical science courses) (Emmert, 1976; Wooldridge, 1976).

The Lehigh study is highly attentive to funding and legislative issues in its discussion of vocational education programs. The first issue discussed is that of the need for funds independent of the correctional institution which give the inmate autonomy in his/her educational pursuits. An example of such funding would be the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG). As the money for vocational education programs stands now, there is conglomerate funding (through state departments of education, state departments of corrections, state departments of vocational rehabilitation, CETA, and LEAA) and multiplicity of sources as well as the uncertainty of continued funding. Thus, programs last only so long as the dollars last and are in fact often designed in the eleventh hour to meet availability of funds.

Other issues in vocational education in corrections are pointed out and include the same problems found in other correctional programs as well as such problems as the inmate's difficult transition from an environment of forced work habits and little use of budgeting skills to outside, productive employment (McCollum, 1973). Also discussed are the need for site-specific needs assessment (Feldman, 1974) and the need for a study of projected labor needs, skill training standards development, and industrial contracting to ensure training equivalency.

In addition, the study reported on the issue of continually updating teacher training in correctional education and discussed the need for a correctional education major in

teacher education institutions (Ayers, 1975; Kerle, 1973).

The study cited as another issue the need for "affirmative legislation" regarding the use of community resources, more work release programs, and employment-seeking release. Moreover, community access of the prison, i.e., the prison as a "community resource," is suggested (Kerle, 1973; Weissman, 1976), and it is reported that extensive services for post-release students are extremely rare, as is the articulation of credits to those in the free world (Cronin et al., 1976).

The study further brings up the need for communication among program administrators and cites the New England Resource Center for Occupational Education (NERCOE) report of 1973 as a document which established the importance of this need. The NERCOE report (entitled The First National Sourcebook: A Guide to Correctional Vocational Training) offers a sampling of vocational training programs regarding their implementation, funding, and operation. All the programs described together met criteria of replicability, uniqueness, success, and distribution (or variety). The programs are divided among seven categories

- School and College Cooperative Programs
- Business and Industry Cooperative Programs
- Trade Union Cooperative Programs
- Professional and Paraprofessional Programs
- New Approaches in Traditional Courses
- Short-Term and Pre-Vocational Programs
- Organizational Methods

For reasons often discussed there are somewhat different issues involved in vocational education for female offenders than in vocational education for the general male offender population. The Lehigh study cites the National Study of Women's Correctional Programs (Glick and Neto, 1976) as the base for any discussion of issues concerning vocational education and female offenders. Issues discussed include the prevalence of stereotypical courses such as clerical courses, nursing, food services, and cosmetology. It is pointed out that if a program happens to be non-stereotypical, it is also usually less complex than a comparable male program. Also discussed is the fact that the low number of incarcerated females reveals a general opinion that females are less threatening (and therefore less subject to stiff sentencing, if any at all) and that females will almost always marry to

be economically stable. In actual fact, 70-90% of incarcerated females will have to become self-supporting upon release (Morse, 1976). Vocational education programs for female offenders share the issues and problems of the other correctional education programs discussed in the Lehigh study, and more. As Glick and Neto (1976) point out:

> It seems clear that we need a different approach to planning and implementing programs for the female offender, an approach based on an accurate profile of the offender, as well as a more realistic assessment of her needs. It is not enough to develop programs based on presumed causes of crime, nor in terms of how the female offender may differ from her male counterpart. A more promising approach is to focus on the female offender as a woman, and examine how her needs relate to those of other women on the outside. (pp. xv-xvi)

The BOAE Report

The planning staff of the Office of the Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education released a report in May, 1976, entitled The Federal Role in Vocational Education in Prisons. The strengths of this report lie in its discussion of obstacles to improving vocational education in corrections, funding agency roles, administration problems, and problems of specific inmate groups.

The first barrier to effective programs is defined as the ambivalent public attitude toward security and rehabilitation which results in a cycle of ineffectiveness. With an institutional and societal emphasis on punishment comes, obviously, an ineffective rehabilitative program which in turn leads to an even greater concern for security and punishment.

The report also states that while vocational education programs must be planned in the light of institutional security and the support of prison industries and maintenance and service activities, the institutional ethic of punishment/security must not be adopted. Also cited as obstacles are (1) the fact that vocational educators have continuous conflicts with the academic educators and (2) that the responsibility for delivery of rehabilitation services is divided among federal and state agencies.

As the report states, many of the agencies involved in rehabilitation of offenders are competing both in terms of

the constituencies they fund and the kind of statutory requirements they demand. A brief look at agencies' roles in funding vocational education programs may reveal why programs become ineffective.

The U.S. Office of Education (OE), through the Vocational Education Act (VEA) of 1968, can allocate funds for programs for the disadvantaged. However, many VEA programs, the BOAE report states, have become sex-role oriented; many states include industry and maintenance programs as VEA projects; and inmates are not empowered to have influence in the writing of state plans which determine direct monetary assistance to the states (for example, civil disability statutes prohibit inmates from voting). Inmates have no input into their own programs. Too, public schools have active constituencies; prisons and jails, the report continues, do not.

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), through the Manpower Development Training Act of 1966 (MDTA), could allocate funds for pilot programs which included full rehabilitation services and cooperation of both state and federal agencies in the development and implementation of the programs. MDTA was not, however, utilized by most institutions and was limited in its effect because it specified that training occur close to the release date. This resulted in the offender's overlong exposure to prison culture and, therefore, often less acceptance of a training program. Moreover, MDTA didn't fulfill its experimental function or its goal of developing innovative programs in diverse occupational areas. It, in fact, focused primarily on in-prison programs and relied on established community programs for other rehabilitation services. It was replaced in 1973 by the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA). However, while offenders are indeed a target group for CETA funds, ongoing funds must be allocated by the states, and target groups must compete with each other for Title III experimental funds and with all others for Title I allocations to states. Too, CETA will provide no new vocational education training programs per se for offenders. The emphasis, rather, is on existing correctional and community resources available for the vocational education component of rehabilitation services. As Gary Weissman (in Cronin, 1976) of the Office of Manpower Programs, DOL has stated, ". . . the Department of Labor is not currently using /earmarked offender program/ monies and has no immediate plans to support Vocational Education programs in State Prisons (p. 77)."

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in response to the results of the President's Crime Commission report in 1967. LEAA Part E funds provided for

the development and implementation of programs or projects for construction, acquisition, and renovation of correctional facilities and for improvement of correctional programs and practices (in the form of block grants and discretionary grants). Part C provided basic grants to states for law enforcement assistance. Most of these funds go for the hiring and training of correctional personnel, legal services for offenders, community programs, and rehabilitation of alcoholics and drug addicts. Only a small part of LEAA dollars goes to vocational education programs.

In June, 1977, Attorney General Griffin Bell released a Department of Justice Study Group report which analyzed the LEAA and made recommendations for its restructuring. The study group states:

> The detailed statutory specification has encouraged state and local governments to focus more on ensuring statutory compliance rather than on undertaking effective planning, since they are virtually assured of Federal approval of the final product as long as all the requirements specified in the statute and LEAA guidelines are met. (p. 8)

In addition, the study group made eight specific recommendations for reorganizing the LEAA. These eight fall under two general recommendations:

(1) Refocus the national research and development role into a coherent strategy of basic and applied research and systematic national program development, testing, demonstration and evaluation. (p. 10)

(2) Replace the present block (formula) portion of the program with a simpler program of direct assistance to state and local governments with an innovative feature that would allow state and local governments to use the direct assistance funds as "matching funds" to buy into the implementation of national program models which would be developed through the refocused national research and development program. (p. 14)

It is the intent of the study group that, if the recommendations are adopted, states and localities will be able to

implement criminal justice programs to fit their specific needs. It remains to be seen whether, even if the recommendations are adopted, when enabling legislation will be forthcoming and, even then, whether the monies allocated will go for effective rehabilitation/reintegration programs which have appropriate educational components.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) is also involved in vocational education for offenders. The BOP is authorized to provide full rehabilitation services for federal prison inmates. Educational programs offered are: ABE, Adult Secondary Education (GED), Postsecondary Education, Social Education, Recreation, and Occupational Education (occupational exploration, vocational education, apprenticeships, and on-the-job training in shops, prison industries, and the community through work release). Within the BOP the Federal Prison Industries, Inc. (FPI) "provide for the vocational training of qualified inmates without regard to their institutional or other assignments" (BOAE, 1976). This sounds quite conscionable, but it must be noted, the report states, that FPI is a profit-making corporation and that, therefore, it emphasizes production through training, not particularly skill acquisition for job market success.

BOAE further reports that the administration of effective vocational programs for offenders involves such problems as undefined concepts, the low priority of rehabilitation programs, the existence of vocational programs mainly for the requirements of prison industry and maintenance and service, and the minimal linkage between vocational education programs and other parts of the rehabilitation program (both in-prison and post-release). Moreover, BOAE offers statistics which show that most of the vocational training of offenders is for low prestige, blue collar, service job areas. This fact, the report says, reflects a bias regarding the work capability of offenders and concentrates on fulfilling institutional needs. The data reveals the concentration of training in but a very few areas and the small percentage of inmates who participate in even the slightly more job market-relevant areas. Thirty-one percent (31%) of prison industries fall into the following areas (one (1) of nine (9) inmates participate):

- furniture manufacture and repair
- garment manufacture
- printing
- tag and sign manufacture

Ninety percent (90%) of prison maintenance activities are concentrated in two areas (48% of the inmates participate):

. general institutional maintenance

. food services (BOAE, 1976)

The BOAE report discusses in particular the problems of jail inmates and female offenders. In local jails, the report states, rehabilitation is generally perceived as determining guilt since the majority of alleged offenders are awaiting legal action such as arraignment, trial, or appeal. Too, the convicted jail inmate is guilty of a misdemeanor and, therefore, is serving a maximum sentence of one year (the average inmate serves less than six months). However, only 26.5% of the programs offered can be completed in less than six months. Furthermore, the jails are particularly oriented toward custody. Ninety percent (90%) of jail personnel were found to be employed in either administrative, custodial, or clerical capacities.

The report continues in its discussion of the problems of jail inmates by describing the limited training available (often, when offered, only in crafts and service work). Idleness and boredom abound because of "passive" recreation (radio, TV, exercise yards), and the facilities are extremely crowded. There is a need, BOAE says, for study and work release programs through which the jail inmate can learn in the community, return to jail, and complete his/her training after release.

The female offender population, as mentioned previously, also suffers from more extensive problems than are usually recognized. With a very small number of incarcerated females, the report explains, even the largest female institution has very few inmates. The training is minimal, therefore, and stereotypical (clerical skills and personal services). Females, perceived as less "rehabilitatable" because their crimes (drug offenses or prostitution) provide them with more monetary incentive than trades, are seen as less in need of training programs. Their crimes are thought to be "victimless," and the "chilvary factor" is strongly evident. Moreover, it is generally assumed that the 80% of female offenders with dependent children will receive welfare support upon release--a cyclical problem at best!

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) Report

This report was funded by the LEAA through the Correctional Education Project of the ECS and was released in March, 1976, as An Overview of Findings and Recommendations of Major Research Studies and National Commissions Concerning Education of Offenders. The report offers analyses of the following five (5) national commission studies and five (5) published national studies:

- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (Washington, D.C., 1973)

- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (Boulder, Colorado, 1973)

- GED Testing in State Penal Institutions (John J. Marsh, Correctional Education, Vol. 25, No. 1, Winter 1973)

- An Evaluation of "Newgate" and Other Prison Education Programs (Marshall, Kaplan, Gans, and Kahn, Inc., 1973)

- School Behind Bars--A Descriptive Overview of Correctional Education in the American Prison System (Syracuse University Research Corp., 1973) (SURC)

- Education for the Youthful Offender in Correctional Institutions (Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, (WICHE), Boulder, Colorado, 1972)

- The Criminal Offender--What Should Be Done (President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation, 1970)

- A Time to Act (The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower, Washington, D.C., 1968)

- State-Local Relations in the Criminal Justice System (Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1971)

- The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice: Task Force on Corrections (Washington, D.C., 1967)

For the purposes of this paper only the following (which appear to be more extensive and/or seminal) ECS analyses of studies will be discussed. (The SURC study was referenced earlier in this paper and will not be discussed in detail here. Likewise, the last study's findings of the year 1967 are reported in more depth in the more recent studies addressed.):

- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973)

- An Evaluation of "Newgate" and Other Prison Education Programs (1973)

- The WICHE Study on Youthful Offenders Education (1972)

- State-Local Relations in the Criminal Justice System (1971)

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. This study resulted in many recommendations still pertinent today. It recommends, for example, that there be inmate involvement in curriculum development and that social and coping skills and basic academic competency be part of the curriculum. The study advocates learning laboratories and programmed, competency-based instruction in which the student knows the objectives in advance of instruction, is offered open entry and exit, proceeds at his/her own rate, and can "test out" and/or "recycle."

In addition, the study recommends that correctional teachers be trained also in social education, reading, and abnormal psychology and that each correctional education department in an institution have on board a school psychologist and a student personnel worker. It also suggests the use of trained inmate instructors, and the utilization of out-of-prison educational programs and correspondence courses for those programs not available locally. It calls, too, for on-going, comprehensive training and evaluation performed in cooperation with community representatives.

However, it should be noted that the committee's recommendations are frequently of a "blanket" nature (e.g., the call for teacher ratios of 1:12 and for learning labs at every institution). These kinds of recommendations therefore may not be the best guide available.

An Evaluation of "NewGate" and Other Prisoner Education Programs. This report offers recommendations based primarily on the NewGate Model, a college education model developed by a project funded in 1969 through OEO. The study calls for in-prison college programs which provide a college atmosphere and support services such as special recruitment, counseling, remediation, pre-release assistance, and post-release financial and emotional support on a college campus. It suggests that programs should address inmates with latent potential and should have open admissions, outreach activities, and offer full time status and a diversity of courses and independent study.

Moreover, the study recommends that staff be hired from the academic community with staff rotation implemented by

the higher education institution and that there be individual and group therapy which is voluntary and confidential and in which the therapist is not an evaluator. The study further suggests that post-release financial support be based on objective, predetermined standards of performance, that post-release campuses have "after-care" offices, that post-release participants have part-time, study-related jobs on campus, and that the released student reside in a program residence house for a specified short period.

In terms of the program/prison environment issue, the study recommends that areas of autonomy be negotiated; e.g., the prison and program administrators could negotiate reparation for the prison's loss of administrative authority through certain benefits derived from the college program which enhance the prison's high school and vocational education programs. It recommends, too, that divisiveness between participants and inmates be prevented by not granting extra privileges to the participants and by assigning peer tutoring jobs to non-participants. This can also be accomplished, the study says, through affirmative action recruiting, by offering remediation, and through encouragement of comparable programs for other inmates. The study goes on to recommend that the college programs not intervene in release decisions and that a governing board of directors be formed by both the prison and college or university.

The WICHE Study on Youthful Offender Education. It reports that very few institutions teach social skills to a population which especially needs such training. It also states that only 10% of youthful offenders are below high school age but that 60% of the youth have not achieved educationally beyond grade 8; that the teachers in youth facilities say that 50% of the youths require remediation, 71% have social problems, and 43% have emotional problems; and that 47% of these teachers say that they themselves had an inadequate formal education.

Concerning prevention, the study suggests that public schools deliver education focused on humanizing interpersonal relationships and that career education be implemented through work-study, internships, apprenticeships, vocational and professional study, and individual assignment to both paid and volunteer craftspersons. It further recommends that ex-offenders be used in the instructional process and that public schools involve students in such governance and administration activities from which they have traditionally been excluded.

State-Local Relations in the Criminal Justice System. This study focuses on adults in prisons. It recommends that community-based programs be expanded and that preservice

and inservice training of all staff be improved. It suggests that compensation rates be raised to attract more qualified teachers and that professional counselors be employed to help inmates prepare for community life.

Also, the study calls for participation incentives, for modern management practices, for repeal of laws prohibiting the sale of prison-made goods, and for control over restrictive labor union practices. It recommends, too, regionalization of state correctional facilities and, thus, expanded work and study release programs which give the inmate more time in the community. It adds that extension courses and self-improvement courses should be offered by universities and colleges within the prison.

The Maryland Model

The Maryland Model is a correctional education model developed at The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, for the purpose of planning "for the improvement of the educational and occupational preparation of criminal offenders within the MDOC (Maryland Department of Correction)." The model centers on 15 components and describes "an administrative structure capable of delivering the model." The components are:

- System's Goals and Objectives
- Population Needs Analysis
- Job Market Analysis
- Job Performance Analysis
- Classification and Assignment Function
- Education Promotion
- Student Recruitment
- Guidance and Counseling Service
- Reward System
- Program Planning
- Curriculum Development, Resources, and Ancillary Services
- Instruction
- Job Placement, Follow-Through, and Follow-up

- Evaluation
- Strategic and Tactical Planning (Whitson, 1976)

Were all the above components implemented, the model states, the program would reveal the following characteristics:

- Education and vocational training are viewed as a comprehensive system whose parts are interrelated.
- All parts of the system are pointed toward the accomplishment of system objectives.
- System goals are detailed and supported by objectives that are specified in measurable terms.
- There is systematic short- and long-range planning for the management and operation of the correctional education model.
- Research on, and evaluation of, the system's performance takes place on a continuing basis.
- The model has centralized planning and management and decentralized operation. (Whitson, 1976)

The administration structure for delivery of the model has the following objectives. . .

- Provide inmates with educational opportunities.
- Provide for articulation.
- Effective resource management.
- Interact positively with other internal correctional functions.
- Coincide with correctional goals. (Whitson, 1976)

and is based on the following standards:

- Program Stigma--the ability of the program to avoid negative labels attached to this particular sub-group of the general population.
- Credentialing--the ability of the program to negotiate and deliver a comprehensive breadth and scope of legitimized licensing and credentialing.

- Maximum Use of Existing Education Resources--ability to maximize the use of the state's existing resources for comprehensiveness and flexibility.

- Education System Impact--the program potential for becoming an established part of the existing education system.

- Corrections Input--the ability to maximize education opportunity for corrections clients that is compatible with present and/or future Corrections Division policy that might affect education policy.

- Potential for Community-Based Corrections Education--the ability to meet the changing clients' needs based on nationwise trends toward community-based corrections systems.

- Financial Consideration--the ability to draw upon sources of funding adequate for initiating and maintaining new corrections education programs.

- Evaluative Mechanisms--the ability of the administrative structure to facilitate the evaluation of corrections education programs. (Whitson, 1976)

Proceedings of the Workshop for Improving Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions

The results of these workshop proceedings are divided into four (4) topics and related concerns which provide relevant, up-to-date statements of what correctional educators and experts are thinking and doing and what they would like to do. Topic 1, How Do We Develop the Role of Vocational Education in Corrections?, raised four (4) concerns:

1. Parameters of vocational education in corrections

2. Inmate career development

3. Inmate needs for academic education

4. Public acceptance of vocational education in corrections

Topic 2, How Do We Meet the Needs of Students?, brought out these concerns:

1. Determine student needs

2. Acknowledge student needs

3. Evaluate efforts to meet student needs

Topic 3, How Do We Develop Realistic Programs in Correctional Vocational Education?, resulted in four (4) concerns expressed by the presenters and participants:

1. Uniqueness of vocational education programs in corrections

2. Personnel development

3. Instructional methodology

4. Job relatedness

And Topic 4, How Do We Develop Cooperative Approaches to Vocational Education in Corrections?, resulted in the following general concern:

1. Strategies for developing cooperation

The participants reorganized their concerns to develop a "Plan of Action" for improving vocational education in corrections. This plan had as its major categories, Research, Personnel Development, Program Improvement, and Cooperation.

Proceedings of the National Conference on Vocational Education in Corrections

The proceedings of this national conference, held in Houston by The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, evidence one of the widest ranges of concerns, recommendations, and descriptions of effective programs to be found anywhere at the present time. The presentations are divided into the following nine sections:

- Setting the Stage

- The 1976 Education Act and Vocational Education in Corrections

- Funding and Delivering Vocational Education in Corrections

- Information Retrieval and Future Technology for Vocational Education in Corrections

- Planning, Accountability, and Standards for Vocational Education in Corrections

- Job Market Information and Offender Placement
- Offender Needs and Interests
- Personnel Development
- Interagency Cooperation

Two of the presentations, one describing the thinking behind the planning for delivering vocational education programs in corrections, the other describing an actual effective program, merit attention in this paper. The other presentations are highly recommended as important discussions of the current critical issues in vocational education in corrections.

The presentation by Mary Ann Evan, entitled "Approaches for Delivering Vocational Education in Corrections," resulted from work by the staff of the Oregon Corrections Education Commission in its analysis of different options available to the state for delivering vocational education in corrections based on eight criteria: program stigma, credentialing, maximum use of resources, education system input, corrections input, potential for community-based education, financial considerations, and evaluative mechanisms. Oregon proposed, finally, the option which involved creation of a semi-autonomous commission because it fulfilled best the eight criteria.

Both the analysis undertaken in Oregon and especially the structure of the semi-autonomous commission proposed by the state have implications for other states' delivery systems. The semi-autonomous commission, as it was proposed in Oregon, would include members from the Corrections Division, the State Department of Education, the State System of Higher Education, the Employment Division, and the community colleges--thus encouraging important linkages. Moreover, the commission approach would be able to avoid stigma "depending upon where it /the commission/ is housed"; it could offer a broad range of credentialing; it could assure "that correction education programs become an established part of the existing education programs placed within the education community; and, most importantly, "the commission would have access to the state's financial education resources for corrections education programs which are not accessible to these programs at this time" (Evan, 1977).

Russell Leik's presentation, "Wisconsin's Mutual Agreement Program (MAP)," has important implications for the current movement toward community-based corrections and the reintegration problems which must be addressed before community-based programs can work. This discussion of Wisconsin's MAP addresses the problem of inmate enfranchisement in his/her own educational

process--a critical issue regarding motivation and eventual job market and personal success.

Funded by LEAA, MAP has seven components:

1. skilled or vocational training
2. work assignments
3. academic education
4. treatment
5. conduct within the institution
6. transfer-security classification
7. other needs
8. target parole date

All of these components involve extensive negotiation between the inmate and support worker or instructor or MAP coordinator and a high degree of mutuality. Inmate appeals regarding any decisions are part of the process and all disputes involve deliberation between the inmate and administrative body.

The success of the MAP program and its impact is described as follows:

> . . . MAP has required /the Division of Correction/ to be accountable for delivering the services if it has agreed to in the contract . . . . MAP has also served as a catalyst to motivate residents to enter into and successfully complete vocational training. The resident in the MAP process is provided a definite role in the planning of his/her activities during confinement and, once a mutually agreed upon contract is signed, has a definite incentive to complete the program in return for a specific release date . . . approximately 78% of the successfully negotiated contracts are completed . . . /and/ the resident /has/ the experience of successfully planning and completing a program designed for his/her reintegration into the community. (p. 141)

The MetaMetrics Report

This report was prepared in April, 1977, for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (HEW)

and is entitled, A Review of Corrections Education Policy for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The findings and recommendations presented in the report are intended by MetaMetrics to be used for HEW policy formulation and implementation concerning corrections education. The report recommends that "national policy encourage corrections education programming at the state and local levels" (pp. 5-10); that HEW involve itself more positively in corrections education through "the establishment of a Representative of Corrections Education within the Office of the Secretary with the function of representing the interests of the corrections clientele similar to the representation provided other minority and disadvantaged groups" (pp. 5-11); and that the following areas of need be addressed:

- state-of-the-art of corrections education technology and learning theory
- survey of existing program models and organizational arrangements
- correctional education standards
- national clearinghouse or reference service
- technical assistance program
- exploration of new funding methods
- innovative educational approaches to corrections education (MetaMetrics, 1977)

The American Correctional Association (ACA) Standards

The ACA, through the Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, has published a Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions which addresses 29 operational and program areas through statements detailing standards expected to be met and brief discussion of those statements. The obvious need for such standards (and the accreditation process involved) is well-stated in the manual (1977):

> The twentieth-century problems of inadequate funding, overcrowding, inmate disturbances, and frequent court intervention demonstrate not only a need for standards, but also a need for their careful and consistent appli-

cation. The implementation of standards via accreditation thus holds great promise for substantial gains in providing humane care and treatment, in redirecting the offender, and in the realization of increased efficiency and effectiveness in the expenditure of public funds.

The National Study of Vocational Education in Corrections Standards

Similarly, this project's current development of national standards addresses the glaring need to "upgrade vocational education programs, establish new goals, update program guidelines, and in general enhance the quality of . . . program offerings, (p. 1)." These standards have not been involved in the process of accreditation but are intended for such involvement in the near future. Meanwhile, they easily serve as statements of conditions which should exist in five areas of vocational education program operations in a correctional institution or system and can, as such, be used by corrections personnel for program improvement.

IV. SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS

The surveys, reports, programs, and models discussed in this review underscore the dissonance between the way things are and the way things should be in vocational education for offenders. It is clear from the data of survey research in corrections and from the nature of proposed models for correctional education that 1) vocational education for offenders, by encompassing GED, ABE, postsecondary, and college programs, must embrace a broader definition than training for job placement; 2) the prevalent punishment/retribution model must give way to a model which involves community access, acceptance, and reintegration buttressed by a firm national policy which supports specific state and local program development accountable to federal models and guidelines; and 3) more effective training of correctional educators must occur to ensure more comprehensive and precise assessment of the educational levels and needs of inmates and to provide for programs both in prison and in the community which address those needs.

The chores of hearing the charges for change in vocational education in corrections, addressing those charges, defusing old mythologies and biases, and changing and establishing appropriate programs for a constituency which is determinedly separated from "real happenings" within our society and culture and routines of everyday life would all seem to militate against effective vocational education in corrections. However, by maintaining an awareness of the kinds of thinking, program development, legislating, and implementation and delivery exemplified in the documents discussed in this paper, and by contributing to thought and action in the field, corrections educators and experts should be able to begin to make a difference--to influence others with more "clout," to involve our culture in "reacceptance" of those who have been unacceptable, and to implement programs which are enfranchising, involving, and "educational" for both the participant and the surrounding community.

REFERENCES

American Friends Service Committee. Struggle for justice--A report on crime and punishment in America. New York: Hill & Wang, 1971.

Ayers, J. D. Observations on educational programs in penal institutions in the United States. Unpublished manuscripts, University of Victoria, August 1975.

Bell, R., Conrad, E., Laffey, T., Volz, C., & Wilson, N. Correctional education programs for inmates: The issues. National Correctional Education Evaluation Project, School of Education, Lehigh University, January 1977.

Black, L. R. Alternative education and corrections: Some new dimensions. Yellow Springs, OH: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, April 1975. (ED 107 603)

Bregman, R., & Frey, V. Report of a study on vocational programs in selected California correctional institutions for male felons. Sacramento, CA: Department of Corrections, June 1975.

Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. The federal role in vocational education in prisons. Washington, DC: Author, May 1976.

Clark, H. M. Quest for community. Unpublished report, 1974. (Available from H. M. Clark, 8 East Long Street, Columbus, Ohio, 43215).

Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. State-local relations in the criminal justice system (1971). In An overview of findings and recommendations of major research studies and national commissions concerning education of offenders, Education Commission of the States, March 1976.

Cronin, F. P., Whitson, C. M., Reinhart, B. A., & Keith, L. S. Improving vocational education in corrections: Proceedings of the workshop for improving vocational education in correctional institutions. (Leadership Training Series No. 47) Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, January 1976.

Cronin, F. P., & Newton, M. (Eds.) National conference on vocational education in corrections (conference proceedings). (Leadership Training Series No. 53) Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, June 1977.

Dell'Apa, F. Educational programs in adult correctional institutions: A survey. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1973.

The Department of Justice Study Group. Report to the Attorney General: Restructuring the Justice Department's program of assistance to state and local governments for crime control and criminal justice system improvement. Washington, DC: Author, June 23, 1977.

Emmert, E. B. Offender assistance programs operated by post-secondary institutions of education--1975-76. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976.

Evan, M. A. Approaches for delivering vocational education in orrections (1977). In National conference on vocational education in corrections (Conference proceedings), F. P. Cronin & M. Newton (Eds.), The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, June 1977.

Feldman, S. D. Trends in offender vocational and education programs: A literature search with program development guidelines. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975.

Glick, R. M., & Neto, V. V. National study of women's correctional programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office (No. 027-000-00-524-1), 1976.

Helfrich, J. E. One effort to upgrade literacy in the correctional population. The Prison Journal, 1973, 53(2), 46-54.

Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower. A time to act (1968). In An overview of findings and recommendations of major research studies and national commissions concerning education of offenders, Education Commission of the States, March 1976.

Kerle, K. Penal education: United States and Europe. The Prison Journal, 1973, 53(2), 4-25.

Leik, R. Wisconsin's mutual agreement program (1977). In National conference on vocational education in corrections (Conference proceedings), F. P. Cronin & M. Newton (Eds.), The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, June 1977.

Levy, G. W., Abram, R. A., & LaDow, D. Final report on vocational preparation in U.S. correctional institutions: A 1974 survey to U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. Columbus, OH: Battelle Columbus Laboratories, 1975.

Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.

Marsh, J. J. GED testing in state penal institutions. Correctional Education, Winter 1973, 25. In An overview of findings and recommendations of major research studies and national commissions concerning education of offenders, Education Commission of the States, March 1976.

Marsh, J. J. Higher education in american prisons. Crime and Delinquency Literature, March 1973, pp. 139-155.

Marshall, Kaplan, Gans, and Kahn, Inc. An evaluation of "Newgate" and other prisoner education programs (1973). In An overview of findings and recommendations of major research studies and national commissions concerning education of offenders, Education Commission of the States, March 1976.

Morse, K. L. The legal issues concerning education of offenders (Report No. 82). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, Correctional Education Project, March 1976.

McCollum, S. G. New designs for correctional education and training programs. Federal Probation, June 1973, 37, 6-11.

McKee, J. M. Materials and technology of adult basic education for corrections. NSPI Journal, 1971, 10(5), 8-12.

MetaMetrics, Inc. A review of corrections education policy for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, DC: National Technical Information Service (PB-268 148), April 1977.

Nagel, W. G. The new red barn: A critical look at the modern American prison. New York: Walker and Co., 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Study report (1973). In An overview of findings and recommendations of major research studies and national commissions concerning education of offenders, Education Commission of the States, March 1976.

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. An exemplary project--community-based corrections in Des Moines. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, n.d.

New England Resource Center for Occupational Education (NERCOE). The first national sourcebook: A guide to correctional vocational training. Newton, MA: Author, 1973.

Olson, A. J. Instructing the functional illiterate. The Journal of Correctional Education, 1975, 27(2), 6-7.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice: Task Force on Corrections. Study report (1967). In An overview of findings and recommendations of major research studies and national commissions concerning education of offenders, Education Commission of the States, March 1976.

President's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation. The criminal offender--what should be done (1970). In An overview of findings and recommendations of major research studies and national commissions concerning education of offenders, Education Commission of the States, March 1976.

Reagen, M. V., Stoughton, D. M., Smith, T. E., & Davis, J. C. School behind bars--A descriptive overview of correctional education in the American prison system (Abridged ed.). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Research Corporation, Policy Institute, 1973.

Research for Better Schools, Inc. Career exploration program. Basic skill instruction in six correctional institutions: Final report. Philadelphia: Author, December 1974.

Roberts, A. R. Sourcebook on prison education--past, present, and future. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.

Roberts, A. R., & Coffey, O. D. A state of the art survey for a correctional education network. College Park, MD: American Correctional Association, September 1976.

Ryan, T. A. Model components. Readings in prison education (A. B. Roberts, ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Singer, N. M. Economic implications of standards for correctional institutions. Crime and Delinquency, 1977, 23(1), 14-31.

Stanley, D. T. Prisoners among us. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1976.

Weissman, G. A. Redefining the problem (1976). In Improving vocational education in corrections: Proceedings of the workshop for improving vocational education in correctional institutions, F. P. Cronin et al, Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, January 1976.

Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education for the Youthful Offender in Correctional Institutions. Study report (1972). In An overview of findings and recommendations of major research studies and national commissions concerning education of offenders, Education Commission of the States, March 1976.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Study report (1973). In An overview of findings and recommendations of major research studies and national commissions concerning education of offenders, Education Commission of the States, March 1976.

Whitson, C. M. The Maryland model: Final report of a project to develop an educational plan for the Maryland Division of Correction. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, October 1976.

Whitson, C. M. The predictability from instructor evaluations of incarcerated vocational students to post-release adjustment to the world of work. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, 1977.

Wooldridge, S. College for prisoners: Ohio's open door. Change, October 1976, pp. 17-20.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

The references listed here provide additional relevant discussion of the philosophy, issues, and practices concerning vocational education in corrections. They should prove useful for anyone interested in the topics addressed in this review or in any related theoretical or practical focus.

Adams, R. D., & Newton, M. A survey and analysis of vocational and pre-vocational education in selected correctional institutions in Kentucky. Bowling Green, KY: Western Kentucky University, Office of Educational Research, July 1971. (VT 013 949)

Adams, S. The PICO project. Readings in Prison Education (A. R. Roberts, ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Adams, S., & Connoly, J. J. Role of junior colleges in the prison community. Junior College Journal, March 1971.

American Correctional Association. The mutual agreement program: A planned change in correctional service delivery. Resource Document No. 3. College Park, MD: Author, 1973.

American Vocational Research Corporation. A report on training and education for the Maryland correctional training center, Hagerstown, Maryland. Washington, DC: Author, March 1971.

Ayllon, T., & Azrin, N. The token economy: A motivational system for theraphy and rehabilitation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Beran, N. J. et al. The community reintegration centers of Ohio: A first year evaluation. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, September 1973.

Beran, N. J. et al. The community reintegration centers of Ohio: A second year evaluation (Criminal Justice System Series Monograph No. 21). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, June 1974.

Brady, J., & Grellotti, R. Massachusetts--study of community-based correctional needs. Massachusetts Department of Corrections, 1972.

Brazzell, C. O., & Gilliam, J. L. Project First Chance: An experimental and demonstration project: Final report. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Corrections, 1969. (ED 052 289)

Carlson, N. A. The future of prisons. Trial. Cambridge, MA: March 1976.

Casselman, J., & Blake, S. M. Community college of Philadelphia at Holmesburg Prison. Journal of Research and Development in Education, Spring 1972, pp. 99-103.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Marshalling citizen power to modernize corrections. Washington, DC: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1972.

Chandler, E. W. Women in prison. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1973.

Colorado state reformatory incentive program. Colorado: Colorado Division of Corrections, 1972.

Cronin, F. P., Abram, R. E., Whitson, C. M., & Reinhart, B. A. Improvement of occupational education in the Federal Bureau of Prisons: Phase I report. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1976.

Dickover, R. M., Maynard, V. E., & Painter, J. A. A study of vocational training in the California Department of Corrections. Research Report No. 40. Sacramento: Department of Corrections, Research Division, 1971.

Drury, E. J. Inventory of higher education programs in state and federal institutions during the 1972-73 academic year. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, 1973.

Education Commission of the States, Correctional education: A forgotten human service. Report No. 76. Denver, CO: Author, January 1976.

Edwards, D. L. What role should the community college play in the field of prison education? Fort Lauderdale, FL: Nova University, 1974. (ED 094 823)

Esarey, J. C. Financing correctional education. Adult Leadership, June 1975.

Feldman, H. S., & Marinelli, R. P. Career planning for prison inmates. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, June 1975.

Fogel, D. We are the living proof--the justice model for corrections. Cincinnati, OH: W. H. Anderson Co., 1975.

Foster, E. A personal statement on jail conditions for women. The women offender report, May-June 1975, pp. 2-3.

Glaser, D. Changes in corrections during the next twenty years--from systems and training analysis of requirements for criminal justice participants. Funded by California Department of Justice, 1971.

Glaser, D. The effectiveness of a prison and parole system. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964.

Glaser, D. From revenge to resocialization: Changing perspectives in combating crime. The American Scholar, Autumn 1971, 40(4), 654-661.

Glaser, D. Routinizing evaluation: Getting feedback on effectiveness of crime and delinquency programs. Washington, DC: National Institute of Mental Health, 1973.

Goffman, E. Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Spectrum Books, 1963.

Greenburg, D. F. A voucher system for corrections. Crime and Delinquency, April 1973.

Hendrix, O. A study in neglect: A report on women prisoners. New York: The Women's Prison Association, July 15, 1972-October 15, 1972.

Hovey, M. The forgotten offenders. Manpower, January 1971.

Hunt, J. W., Bowers, J. E., & Miller, N. Laws, licenses and the offender's right to work: A study of state laws restricting the occupational licensing of former offenders. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse on Offender Employment Restrictions, The American Bar Association, Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services and Criminal Law Section, 1974.

Johnson, S. E, Jr. Using vocational skill clusters to teach adult basic education. Readings in prison education, (A. R. Roberts, ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Joselson, M. Prison education: A major reason for its importance. Corrective Psychiatry and Journal of Social Therapy. 1971, 17(2).

Kaye, T. Developing jobs for ex-offenders. Manpower, July 1974.

Keyes, D., & Robinson, S. Inmate vocational training: A national overview. Correctional Education, Spring 1973.

Killinger, G. G., & Cromwell, P. F. Corrections in the community: Alternatives to imprisonment (Selected Readings). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co., 1974.

Korim, A. S. Improving corrections personnel through community colleges: Final report. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice. The nation's jails. Washington, DC: Author, May 1975.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice. Prisoners in state and federal institutions. National Prisoners Statistics Bulletin. Washington, DC: Author, May 1975.

Leiberg, L., & Parker, W. Toward change in correctional manpower services: Mutual agreement programming. Correctional treatment of the offender. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Mardell, E. A. Curriculum guide: Life skills course for corrections. Prince Albert, Canada: Saskatchewan Newstart, 1972.

Martinson, R. What works?--questions and answers about prison reform. Public Interest, 1974, 35, 22-54.

McArthur, V. A. From convict to citizen: Programs for the woman offender. Washington, DC: D.C. Commission on the Status of Women, June 1974.

McCabe, M. P., & Driscoll, B. College admission opportunities and the public offender. Morehead, KY: Morehead State University, 1971. (ED 061 906)

McCollum, S. G. College programs for prisoners--some critical issues. Paper presented at The National Conference on Higher Education, American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, IL, 1975. (ED 104 282)

McCollum, S. G. New designs for correctional education and training programs. Federal Probation, June 1973, 32, 6-11.

McCollum, S. G. The potential of new educational delivery systems for correctional treatment: A correctional education handbook. Washington, DC: Bureau of Prisons, 1973.

McCreary, P. G., & McCreary, J. M. Job training and placement for offenders and ex-offenders. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

McDonnell, J. Profiles of inmate training projects: An evaluation of the training provided in correctional institutions under the manpower development training act, Section 251: Vol. II. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, 1971. (VT 014 176)

McGee, R. A. Idle hands in the devil's workshop. Manpower, January 1971.

Miller, H. S. The role of prison industries now and in the future: A planning study. Washington, DC: Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1975. (ED 117 441)

Miller, M. J. Vocational training in prisons: Some social policy implications. Federal Probation, 1972, 26.

Mitford, J. Kind and usual punishment. New York: Random House (A Vintage Book), 1974.

Mogilnicki, R. L. Continuing education in prison. Journal of Continuing Education and Training, May 1972.

Monroe, W. E., & Whitson, C. M. Unique prison school district emphasizes vo-ed training. School Shop, March 1975.

Moos, R. H. Evaluating correctional and community settings. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Morris, D. W. The universities' role in prison education. Readings in Prison Education (A. R. Roberts, ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Morris, N. The future of imprisonment. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Murray, L. The school district concept. Adult Leadership, June 1975.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Newgate directory. Hackensack, NJ: Newgate Resource Center, 1973.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Newgate model. Hackensack, NJ: Newgate Resource Center, n.d. (ED 076 871)

Neff, D. R. Vocational education in state and federal adult correctional institutions in the United States. Unpublished dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1972.

North, D. S. Women offenders: breaking the training mold. Manpower, February 1975.

Ohlin, L. E. Prisoners in America. 42nd American Assembly, Columbia University (1972). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Oregon Board of Control, Research and Program Evaluation. Follow-up study of vocational programs at Oregon State Penitentiary and Oregon State Correctional Institution. Salem, OR: Oregon Board of Control, Research and Evaluation Division, 1969.

Polivchak, P. A lesson in industry-education partnership. American Vocational Journal, February 1974.

Rajoppi, R. Commission on vocational education in correctional institutions: Final report. Trenton, NJ: Commission on Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions, June 1972. (ED 064 583)

RCE Institutes. Invisible prison--an analysis of barriers to inmate training and post-release employment in New York and Maine. New York: Author, 1972.

Rehabilitation Research Foundation. The Draper project, Vol. 2, final report. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, 1968.

Roberts, A. R. Academic and vocational education: Introduction. Readings in prison education (A. R. Roberts, ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Roberts, A. R. A systems approach to correctional education. Readings in prison education (A. R. Roberts, ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Roberts, A. R. Alternative strategies for offender rehabilitation. Correctional treatment of the offender. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Roberts, A. R. Guidelines for post-secondary education programs. Correctional treatment of the offender. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Robinson, J., & Smith, G. The effectiveness of correctional programs. Crime and Delinquency, January 1970.

Ryan, T. A., & Ryans, D. G. (Eds.). Collection of papers presented for 1970 national seminars on adult basic education in corrections. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, February 1970.

Sheffer, H. V. Directed corrections or corrected directions. Community and Junior College Journal, August/September 1973.

Sinclair, W., & Moulden, W. E. Educating prisoners for socially constructive roles. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, August 1974. (ED 093 858)

Singer, N. M. Economic implications of standards for correctional institutions. Crime and Delinquency, 1977, 23(1), 14-31.

Slamony, L. D. Corrections education in Oregon: A way to proceed--a report to the State Corrections Education Commission. ERIC Current Awareness Service, 1974.

Smith, R. R., McKee, J. M., & Milan, M. A. Study release policies of American correctional agencies: A survey. Journal of Criminal Justice, Winter 1974. (ED 101 170)

Spencer, C., & Berecochea, J. E. Vocational training at the California Institution for Women: An evaluation. Research Report No. 41. Sacramento, CA: California State Government, 1971.

Spencer, G. L., & Siler, T. Survival education. California Youth Authority Quarterly, Summer 1974.

Stevenson, G. MAP to parole. Manpower, April 1975.

Stowell, G. F. Work and education release in Connecticut: An analysis of post release effects on inmate participants. Storrs, CT: Connecticut Department of Corrections and University of Connecticut, April 1974.

Taggert, R. Manpower programs for criminal offenders. Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 95, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1972.

Taylor, A. Beyond rehabilitation: The Federal City College Lorton project--a model prison higher education program. The Journal of Negro Education, Spring 1974.

Thorndike, R. L. The prediction of vocational success. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1963, 11.

Tompkins, D. C. Prison and the prisoner: Public policy bibliographies. California: Institute of Governmental Studies, 1972.

Waldron, R. J., Uppal, J. C., Quarles, C. L., McCauley, R. P., Harper, H., Fraser, R. L., Benson, J. C., & Altemose, J. R. The criminal justice system: An introduction. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

Wheatley, R. Improving the quality and quantity of vocational education in corrections: A selected bibliography of resources in correctional vocational education. Columbus, OH: The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, June 1977.

Whitson, C. M., Monroe, W. E., Clark, C. L., & Smith, C. L. Vocational follow-up project of the Windham School District in the Texas Department of Corrections. Huntsville, TX: Windham School District, 1974.

Whitson, C. M., Waldron, R., Monroe, W. E., Smith, C. L., & Robinson, R. Cooperative follow-up project of the Windham School District and the Texas Department of Corrections. Huntsville, TX: Windham School District, 1975.

Windham School District, Texas Department of Corrections. The reality adjustment program. Huntsville, TX: Vocational Media Center, 1974.

Wisconsin, State of. Accredited vocational education opportunities in Wisconsin prisons. Madison, WI: The Interagency Committee on Corrections, 1976.

PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lester Belleque
Chief, Jail Inspection &
Misdemeanant Services
Oregon Division of
Corrections

Lowell A. Burkett
Executive Director
American Vocational Assoc.

Ken Carpenter
Chief of Corrections
Office of Regional Operations
U.S. Dept. of Justice, LEAA

Bennett Cooper
Administration of Justice
Division
Ohio Dept. of Economic &
Community Development

LeRoy Cornelson (ex-officio)
Director of Planning
Bureau of Occupational &
Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education

Dan Dunham, State Director
Division of Voc-Tech Education
Maryland State Department of
Education

Robert Fosen
Executive Director
Commission on Accreditation
(ACA)

Ruth Glick
Chief, Correctional Planning
California Dept. of Corrections

Byrl Shoemaker, Director
Division of Vocational Education
Ohio State Department of
Education

Allen Sielaff
Administrator
Wisconsin Division of Corrections

Anthony P. Travisono
Executive Director
American Correctional Association

STUDY OBJECTIVES

The major objectives of the National Study of Vocational Education in Corrections were:

- To describe the state-of-the-art of vocational education in corrections as it is reflected in contemporary literature and documents.
- To identify and synthesize a set of standards by which vocational education programs, operations, and outcomes may be evaluated.
- To survey nationally all vocational education programs in corrections to develop a data base for future planning and evaluation.

NATIONAL STUDY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN CORRECTIONS

TECHNICAL REPORTS

1. Vocational Education in Corrections: An Interpretation of Current Problems and Issues.

2. Standards for Vocational Education Programs in Correctional Institutions.

3. Vocational Education in Correctional Institutions: Summary of a National Survey.

AVAILABILITY

For information on the availability of these reports contact: CVE Publications, The Center for Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210.